DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 428 TM 003 642

AUTHOR Markus, Frank W.; Huys, George
TITLE Measuring Effectiveness of a Principals' Desegregation Workshop.
PUB DATE [Nov 73]
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Memphis, Tennessee, November 1973)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Responsibility; Educational Objectives; Human Relations; *Principals; *Program Evaluation; Racial Attitudes; *Racial Integration; Workshops

ABSTRACT

The Department of Educational Administration and Supervision of Memphis State University offered a Desegregation Workshop for approximately 200 administrators during the 1971-72 school year. This workshop, with some modification, continued the Memphis City Schools' initial efforts of 1970-71. This study determined the improvement of the participants, as reflected by their perceptions in: awareness and skill in human relations, racial attitudes, and administrative knowledge and skills. It also sought to determine their success in achieving workshop and small group objectives. Three questionnaires were used (one open-ended, another using a Likert scale, and a repeat of the 1970-71 questionnaires to secure longitudinal data) to arrive at base line information regarding the purposes. The Likert scale is included in the appendix. Analyzing the responses to the questionnaires it may be concluded that the participants improved in human relations, racial attitudes, and administrative effectiveness, as well as achieving success in all goal areas. (Author/MLP)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 091428

TM 003 642

MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS OF A PRINCIPALS' DESEGREGATION WORKSHOP

by

Frank W. Markus, Chairman,
Department of Educational Administration and Supervision

and

George Huys, Professor of
Educational Administration and Supervision

College of Education
Memphis State University

Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the
Mid-South Educational Research Association
Memphis, Tennessee November 17, 1973

MEMPHIS PRINCIPALS ASSOCIATION

ESAP DESEGREGATION WORKSHOP EVALUATION

INTRODUCTION

In school district after school district efforts to desegregate the schools encountered problems of infinite variety--from lack of availability of physical facilities to complex attitudinal situations. Efforts to desegregate the Memphis City Schools were characterized by the same experience. It was evident to the school district and community that in-service education was needed--especially for school leaders--to make desegregation in Memphis more effective. Consequently, a desegregation workshop for principals was offered during the 1970-71 school year. With the complex considerations involved in desegregation, the participants recognized before the end of this workshop that additional in-service efforts would be needed to alleviate and/or eliminate problems to more effectively desegregate the schools.

The Memphis Principals Association Desegregation Workshop (1971-72) was a joint undertaking of the Association and the Memphis State University College of Education's Department of Educational Administration and Supervision. It should be noted, however, that Memphis State's participation was based on an understanding that the workshop would have to be the principals' program. Thus, the

workshop objectives, projected activities and evaluation procedures were cooperatively determined and approved by the Memphis Principals Association.

Approximately two hundred (200) principals and assistant principals participated in the workshop and engaged in a broad variety of experiences: resource people were utilized--including nationally prominent speakers, community leaders, area consultants, central office personnel, principals, teachers and students; films and film strips; role playing, etc. The basic approach was small group discussion with consultant assistance from the Memphis State University College of Education's Department of Educational Administration. The participants were divided into fourteen (14) small groups of approximately fourteen participants who concentrated on the following broad areas:

1. The Role of the School Administrator as it Relates to Desegregation in Improving Human Relations, e.g., board members; central and area administration; inter and intra school administrators; faculties; staff; parents; pupils.

2. The role of the School Administrator as it Relates to Desegregation in Developing Instructional Leadership and Curriculum Change.

3. The Role of the School Administrator as it Relates to Desegregation in Improving and Maintaining Good School-Community Relations, e.g., Pressure Groups; Social and Governmental Agencies; Colleges and Universities.

4. The Role of the School Administrator as it Relates to Desegregation in Fulfilling Legal, Financial, and Business Responsibilities of the School.

In addition, the principals were given an opportunity to participate in groups which combined topics 1 and 2, and topics 3 and 4.

Working in the above areas, the groups pursued their objectives over a thirteen (13) week period.

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

The major objective of the workshop was: "to improve understanding and implementation of the policies and procedures which enhance desegregation practices." Specific objectives which were developed and pursued were:

1. To identify and improve skills in human relations.

2. To gain additional instructional knowledge calculated to increase the principal's effectiveness in the role of instructional leadership and staff development.

3. To learn those elements of change and activities which will assist the principal in his role as an agent of curriculum improvement and change.

4. To identify the causal relationship between the problems of the principalship in the areas relative to staff development and school experiences.

5. To review and renew an acquaintance with proven and established techniques of good school-community relations especially as pertaining to the principals' association with community groups; private, social and governmental agencies; and, colleges and universities.

6. To develop and improve the principal's expertise in effectively communicating with the school's various publics including the students, the staff, the central office personnel, the elected board, and the community.

7. To know and fully understand the principal's legal responsibilities in fulfilling the school's educational objectives, and especially those financial and procedural goals as established by board policy and administrative regulations.

8. To establish a ready resource of interested and informed professionals to assist the individual principal in meeting the special needs incident to desegregation through an expanded systematic schedule of association meetings and activities.

9. To identify the problem similarities and differences among the various principalships to become better acquainted with the techniques of problem identification and resolution within the association's membership.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

An evaluation design which included elements of process and product evaluation was utilized to determine the effectiveness of the workshop. The basic criteria for the evaluation were the workshop objectives plus the objectives that were developed by each of the small groups. Each identifiable segment of the workshop was isolated for the purpose of process evaluation and the total workshop experience was evaluated as to product. A pre-post test was also utilized in an effort to determine attitudinal change regarding specifically identifiable problems in desegregation.

Three evaluation instruments were used to assess the workshop and achievement of its objectives. In large measure the instruments were designed to elicit the perceptions of the participants.

The first instrument was used for the pre-post test and had been developed and used in the 1970-71 workshop. It was utilized in this instance primarily to assess attitudinal changes. It solicited personal and professional data and reactions to: program format and procedures, merits of the workshop regarding racial composition of

faculties, racial understanding, faculty morale, teacher selection, discipline problems, consultant service, decentralization and line and staff relationships.

The second instrument was designed specifically by the MSU College of Education's Department of Educational Administration and Supervision consultants to secure perceptions as they related to the 1971-72 workshop objectives, program and procedures, and a comparison with the 1970-71 workshop. The responses were made primarily to a Likert-type scale (see Appendix A).

The third instrument was open-ended. It urged the participants to convey, in writing, their suggestions and constructive criticisms regarding any facet of the workshop.

The instruments were administered at the end of the workshop at a session especially held to evaluate the workshop and the achievement of its objectives. One-hundred eighty (180) participants responded to the evaluation instruments. Of this number one-hundred thirty-four (134) were male and forty-three (43) were female (3 did not respond). Seventy-seven (77) were Black and ninety-six (96) were White (7 did not respond). The data were treated to avoid identification and to ensure privacy.

The Memphis State University Computing Center processed the data to secure percentage comparisons by race and sex. Percentage comparisons were also computed for appropriate items for the various subgroups.

FINDINGS

The overall reaction to the workshop format, procedures and facilitation were very positive (see Appendix A, Items 1 - 19). This was also true regarding similar items in the post-test questionnaire.

The findings regarding the specific workshop objectives are as follows:

Objective 1.1--To identify and improve skills in human relations.

The responses indicated that approximately two-thirds of the respondents thought that they had improved their skill in human relations and that as a result of the workshop they had increased awareness of human relations in the school to which they were assigned. Also, almost 40 percent of the participants indicated the workshop was instrumental in specific changes being made to improve human relations at their school. If this latter response reflects the situation accurately, approximately sixty schools in the system have taken action to imrpove human relations. It should be noted, however, that the subgroup responses varied substantially regarding this point. Seventy-one percent of one subgroup agreed specific changes had been encouraged by the workshop while only nine percent of another subgroup agreed this was the case.

Since effecting changes are related to changed attitude, additional success in achieveing this objective can be construed from the fact that only sixteen percent of the

respondents indicated that the workshop had not improved their understanding of the opposite race. A review of the comparative responses for the 1970-71 and 1971-72 workshops showed an improved situation.

It was also interesting to note that the Blacks and Whites and Males and Females responded similarly. The greatest improved understanding purportedly was gained by Whites and Males.

Over eighty (80) percent of the Blacks, Whites, Males and Females indicated that the workshop had helped them administratively. While the question was phrased in an administrative framework it obviously had human relations implications and a positive response would indicate improved skills in this area. The subgroup responses also reflected agreement in this regard.

Objective 1.2--To gain additional instructional knowledge calculated to increase the principal's effectiveness in the role of instructional leadership and staff development.

Almost sixty (60) percent of the respondents indicated the workshop helped to increase their effectiveness as instructional leaders and in staff development. The subgroup data did not reveal a great deal of variation from the total group data.

Objective 1.3--To learn those elements of change and activities which will assist the principal as an agent of change and curriculum improvement.

The activities participated in to achieve the above objective were fairly successful in that over half of the participants reported that the workshop helped increase their

effectiveness as curriculum change agents. Again, we find that the subgroups' reactions generally were much like the reaction of the total group. However, only a third of three subgroups felt their effectiveness improved in this regard while almost two-thirds to three-fourths of the other subgroups held this opinion.

Objective 1.4--To identify the causal relationship between problems of the principalship in areas relative to staff development and school experiences.

This objective and/or the instruments needed greater precision or correlation to enable more meaningful assessment. However, the respondents did rank the causality of school problems in the areas of discipline, pupil absenteeism, poor pupil-teacher relations, teacher attendance, non-professional factors, and teacher morale.

As a whole the rankings for 1971-72 are similar to those of the previous year but some interesting changes did occur. For example, "teacher apathy," which ranked sixth as a cause for severe discipline problems in 1970-71, was ranked third in 1971-72. "Interest in education being secondary," ranked third in 1970-71 as a reason for poor teacher attendance, was ranked first in 1971-72. It switched places with: "Deductions for absenteeism are too low" which dropped from first in 1970-71 to third in 1971-72. Low teacher morale was perceived in 1970-71 as being most frequently caused by "the inability to

cope with the thought of being transferred." In 1971-72 student discipline or apathy ranked first whereas it had been fourth in 1970-71. Other than the foregoing changes, the rankings were similar.

The percentage responses by race and sex showed some interesting variations. For example, 45 percent of the Whites thought lack of parental control and/or support was the main reason for severe discipline problems, while only 14 percent of the Blacks thought so. The majority of the Blacks (32 percent) thought the main reason was inadequate teacher understanding of students, while only 11 percent of the Whites ranked this first.

Whites, Males, and Females ranked attitudes of parents toward attendance as the main reason for pupil absenteeism, while the Blacks indicated the main reason was the inability of teachers to keep students in the classroom.

Whites and Females indicated the main reason for low teacher morale was their inability to cope with the thought of being transferred. The larger percentage of Blacks (19 percent) attributed it to racial attitudes toward one another and males cited student discipline or apathy to the largest extent.

Objective 1.5--To review and renew an acquaintance with proven and established techniques of good school-community relations especially as pertaining to the principals' association with community groups; private, social and governmental agencies; and, colleges and universities.

No attempt was made to assess this objective for each of the various groups, but for "community groups" as a whole. The responses indicate that almost two-thirds of the participants felt that the workshop helped them become more aware of and effective in communicating with "community groups." The subgroups generally concurred, except for two subgroups, for which only one-third felt this was true and only 40 percent of another subgroup thought they had benefited in this regard. However, all of the members of still another subgroup thought they were more aware of and effective in working with community groups, as did over three-fourths of the remaining subgroups.

Objective 1.6--To develop and improve the principal's expertise in effectively communicating with the school's various publics including the students, the staff, the central office personnel and the elected board and the community.

Over 60 percent of the respondents thought the workshop would enable them to work more effectively with students. The reaction of the subgroups was similar, but two subgroups indicated only 40 percent of their members found this to be true. On the other hand, three-fourths or more of three other subgroups felt this was the case. Forty (40) percent of the respondents said the workshop would help them work

more effectively with the central office staff. The subgroups generally agreed, ranging from a low of 9 percent for one subgroup to a high agreement of 69 percent for another.

Objective 1.7--To know and fully understand the principal's legal responsibilities in fulfilling the school's educational objectives, and especially those financial and procedural goals as established by board policy and administrative regulation.

Half of the respondents said the workshop helped them become more knowledgeable and effective regarding their legal responsibilities related to the district's financial and procedural goals. However, subgroup responses varied with four subgroups indicating less than one-third agreement that such help was forthcoming, while ninety (90) percent or more in two other subgroups indicated they became more effective in these areas.

Over 60 percent of the respondents said the workshop helped them to become more knowledgeable about and effective in caring for their legal responsibilities as related to fulfilling the school's educational objectives. Subgroup reactions, however, varied substantially with one subgroup in one-third agreement that this was true while all the members in three of the subgroups responding that this was the case.

Objective 1.8--To establish a ready resource of interested and informed professionals to assist the individual principal in meeting the special needs incident to desegregation through an expanded systematic schedule of Association meetings and activities.

The list of resource people (see Appendix B) used in the workshop has helped to increase the principal's awareness of available resource people.

Three-fourths of the participants indicated that the group-selected resource people contributed greatly to the achievement of their objectives. Only two subgroups reported substantially less agreement that such was the case while in two other subgroups all of the respondents agreed and still another eight subgroups reported more than two-thirds agreement.

Also, the Memphis Principals Association, as a result of the workshop experience, planned to appoint a committee comprised of persons on the staff who had experience in integrated schools. Members of this committee would be on call and available to assist colleagues who needed help in this area. The Memphis Principals Association also planned to expand, increase and systematize other activities which would be helpful in this regard.

Objective 1.9--To identify the problem similarities and differences among the various principalships to become better acquainted with the techniques of problem identification and resolution within the association's membership.

The discussion following Objective 1.4 concerning the principals' ranking of causality of problems showed a

substantial degree of agreement. Some variations relating to race and sex were noted. However, this showed at least partial achievement of the objective as it relates to the identification of problem similarities and differences.

Since the individual subgroup workshop objectives were in large measure based upon current and long-range problems, any progress toward their resolution would be an indication of achievement of Objective 1.9. Item 39 of Appendix A reveals attainment in this regard.

Assuming that each group had a maximum of four objectives, one-hudnred twelve (112) responses indicated that one or more small group objectives had been wholly achieved. Making the same assumption, two-hundred ninety-seven (297) responses indicated that one or more small group objectives had been partially achieved. Also, again with the same assumption noted above, only forty (40) responses indicated that no achievement had been made on one or more small group objectives. Thus, it would appear the substantial progress had been made toward achieving Objective 1.9.

Over eighty (80) percent of the principals indicated that the workshop was relevant to the needs and concerns of the principals and almost as many, seventy-one (71) percent, agreed or strongly agreed that the workshop in comparison with other professional experiences was very beneficial (see Items 8 and 10, Appendix A).

While the above data . rst two instruments was directed toward specific aspects o. the workshop and its objectives, the open-ended instrument gave free rein for any comments which could be directed to the above or focus in on aspects not considered in the other two instruments. Both positive and negative responses were received. Space does not permit a listing of the comments received but a tabulation of the comments received revealed that more comments were positive than negative.

Appendix C reveals a total of 282 positive and 252 negative comments (or implications). Eight subgroups had net positive responses, while six had net negative responses. It should also be noted that no weighting was given the responses. Obviously one positive response may not offset one negative response and vice versa.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the findings relative to the specific objectives it can be concluded that substantial progress was made toward achieving the workshop's major goal--"to improve understanding and implementation of policies and procedures which enhance desegregation practices." Further, the responses to specific items related to the specific objectives indicated that varying, but substantial, degrees of success were achieved for each. The responses to the items related to the specific objectives brought positive responses of from fifty (50) to seventy-five (75) percent, except for the ability to work more effectively with the central office, where the positive response was forty (40) percent, the undecided response was thirty (30) percent and the negative response was also thirty (30) percent.

The open-ended responses provide a basis for concluding that some of the suggestions, as well as the experience gained therefrom, made after the first workshop (1970-71) enabled adjustments to be made in the second workshop (1971-72) which in turn led to adjustments being made in the third workshop. This naturally should be the case if the evaluative process serves as a basis for improvement.

The variation in the degree of success regarding the specific objectives, especially as evidenced in subgroup responses, shows that additional in-service work is necessary. The open-ended responses further verify this conclusion. However, it should be noted that negative responses reported in the open-ended instrument at times have possible

positive implications in that the workshop probably contributed to an increased awareness of the factors involved in desegregation.

Furthermore, it can be concluded that the workshop was a success on several bases in addition to the previously presented data. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents said the workshop was relevant to their needs and concerns. Seventy-one (71) percent of the respondents reported that compared to other professional experiences the workshop was very beneficial.

Another criteria of the success of this or any workshop is the degree of participation. This workshop had the highest attendance level that can be remembered for endeavors of this nature. Memphis City Principals and Assistant Principals had a total participation of ninety-six (96) percent.

APPENDIX A

ESAP PRINCIPALS' DESEGREGATION WORKSHOP (1971-72)

*Numbers under designations are percentages (numerical value for mean)

		%				
	*5	4	3	2	1	Mean
1. The physical facilities for the sessions were very adequate.	55	43	0	1	0	4.5
2. The workshop staff expedited the routine tasks and requests of the groups.	39	54	4	1	0	4.3
3. The format of the workshop was desirable.	15	65	11	5	3	3.9
4. The weekly newsletter containing the various small group minutes were beneficial.	60	33	4	2	0	4.5
5. The opportunity to have cokes, coffee, and sandwiches was a plus factor.	67	31	1	1	0	4.6
6. Being paid for attending the workshop which was held after the school day was a plus factor.	66	27	2	3	1	4.6
7. The opportunity to make up missed sessions was a plus factor.	52	39	6	1	1	4.4
8. Overall the workshop was relevant to the needs and concerns of the participants.	13	60	14	10	2	3.7
9. This workshop has improved communication among and between local school administrators and potential local school administrators (principals, assistant principals and administrative interns).	17	56	17	7	2	3.8
10. In comparison with other professional experiences this workshop was very beneficial.	11	60	18	9	2	3.7
11. As a result of the workshop I am reexamining what I had considered to be the most important social issues of the day.	7	49	18	22	4	3.3
12. The Steering Committee fulfilled its responsibilities very well.	22	66	9	2	1	4.1
13. The availability of the instructor during group sessions was adequate.	13	65	7	13	1	3.8
14. The participation and assistance of the instructors when available to groups was beneficial.	16	63	11	6	2	3.9
15. Our small group discussion leader (chairman) was very effective.	33	46	8	9	3	4.0

		%				
	5	4	3	2	1	Mean
16. Our small group recorder was very effective in expressing our reactions and thoughts in the minutes for the weekly newsletter.	42	48	4	5	0	4.2
17. The group-selected resource people contributed greatly to achieving small group objectives.	20	54	15	9	2	3.8
18. More funds should have been allocated for groups to secure resource people.	4	26	28	23	17	2.8
19. Several participants monopolized the conversation in our small group.	15	46	8	23	8	3.4
20. Members of our small group, myself included, tried to keep them from monopolizing the discussion.	8	43	20	23	5	3.3
21. The small group sessions permitted adequate opportunity for individual participation.	38	56	2	3	0	4.3
22. The workshop will enable me to work more effectively with students.	14	47	22	13	3	3.6
23. The workshop will enable me to work more effectively with central office personnel.	6	33	30	25	5	3.1
24. As a result of the workshop I have improved my skill in human relations.	9	55	22	13	1	3.6
25. As a result of the workshop I have an increased awareness of human relations in the school to which I am assigned.	10	59	16	12	2	3.6
26. The workshop was instrumental in specific changes being made at my school to improve human relations.	5	34	32	24	4	3.1
27. The workshop helped to improve my effectiveness as an instructional leader.	4	62	18	13	1	3.5
28. The workshop helped to increase my effectiveness as a change agent as related to curriculum improvement.	3	47	26	19	3	3.3
29. The workshop helped me to become more effective in staff development.	9	43	28	12	2	3.5
30. The workshop helped me to become more knowledgeable and effective concerning the principal's legal responsibilities as related to financial and procedural goals as established by Board policy and/or administrative regulation.	10	40	25	19	4	3.3
31. The workshop helped me to be more aware of and effective in working with "community groups."	10	53	18	16	2	3.5

		%				
		5	4	3	2	1	Mean
32.	The workshop helped me to become more knowledgeable and effective concerning the principal's legal responsibilities as related to fulfilling the school's educational objectives.	10	51	19	18	1	3.5

		Yes	No	Mean
33.	I would participate in a similar workshop if another one was held under similar circumstances.	92	5	1.9

34. Please rank (1 most beneficial, 2 next most beneficial, etc.) the following workshop activities which are presented in chronological order:

		5	4	3	2	1	Mean
A.	Dr. Davis' session organizing the groups for more effective groupwork.	100	76	59	29	10	3.3
B.	Sessions involving discussion in small groups without local or national speakers.	100	94	79	65	46	2.2
C.	Sessions involving small group discussions with local or national speakers.	100	94	78	49	19	2.6
D.	Session with Dr. Lindsay Todd (Meridian, Miss.)	100	70	46	18	5	3.6
E.	Session with Dr. John Codwell (Houston, Tex.)	100	91	71	43	19	2.8

		5	4	3	2	1	Mean
35.	The opportunity for the participants in the small groups to determine their own objectives and, in the main, plan their own activities was beneficial.	31	49	12	4	3	4.0

		Yes	No	Mean
36.	Our objectives changed as the workshop progressed.	55	43	1.6

		5	4	3	2	1	Mean
37.	The discussions and activities which influenced the change in objectives as the workshop progressed were very beneficial.	100	93	49	15	5	3.4
38.	The degree to which our small group achieved its objectives was satisfactory.	6	57	18	15	3	3.5

39. On the basis of your small group obejctives (which have been passed out for this evaluation session) please respond to your small group objectives as they are numbered.

Objective #	Wholly Achieved	Partially Achievedy	No Achievement	Mean
A	26	70	2	
B	17	46	6	
C	10	28	10	
D	8	15	3	2.2

		%					
		5	4	3	2	1	Mean
40.	This evaluation is not worth a _____.	9	11	41	18	19	2.7

APPENDIX B

DATE / GP	17 or 18	24 or 25	31 or 1	7 or 8	14 or 15	21 or 22	28 or 29	13 or 14	20 or 21	27 or 28
A				Mr. M. Phillips Mr. B. Young Mr. J. Pendergrast	Ms. M. Wilburn		Ms. N. Logan Mr. D. Hollingsworth Mr. B. Wicker	Joe Yates, John Arnett, Angela Barksdale, David McRae, Roddy Gringa,	Dr. L. Todd (MAR. 13 - Kay Taylor, Scott Ray, Karen Lebovitz)	
B					Ms. A. Norris				Dr. Lindsey Todd	Dr. John Codwe
C					Ms. L. Gilder Mr. J. Catching Mr. C. Garrett					
A									Dr. Lindsey Todd	(TOTAL GROUP INVOLVEMENT DR. JOHN CODWELL)
B						Jacqueline Partee, Pat Rogers, Joe Miller, Rex Gandy (students)	Mr. J. Pendergrast Mrs. P. Kelley		Dr. Lindsey Todd	
C	(TOTAL GROUP INVOLVEMENT - DR. ROBERT DAVIS)				Mr. J. Christopher	Ms. J. Nichols, Ms. S. McGarrity, Ms. E. Lee, Ms. A. Thompson	Nick Haynes, Mary Willis (students)			
1 & 2A			Mr. B. Taylor	Dr. G. Olds Mr. B. Young	Mr. James Christopher			Mr. J. B. Childers		
1 & 2B				Mr. R. Waller	Ms. Phyllis Kelley	Mrs. Norma Logan	Ms. G. Russell, Ms. E. Seymour, Ms. A. Cagan, Ms. E. Pardue	Dr. Claire Henry	Dr. Lindsey Todd	Ms. Lorena Wess Ms. Gloria Whit Ms. Ophelia Flo
1 & 2C				Mr. R. Waller Mr. M. Phillips			Ms. P. Kelly Mr. J. Pendergrast		Dr. Lindsey Todd	
1 & 2D				Mr. M. Phillips Mrs. R. Kinney	Mr. J. Christopher Mr. R. Waller		Mr. J. Turetzky, Ms. D. King, Ms. J. Doerflein	Mr. R. Roby Mr. H. Osborne	Dr. Lindsey Todd	
3A				(FEB. 14 - Mr. E. Simon, Ms. R. Brown, Ms. W. Kerr, Ms. M. Wilburn, Ms. B. Cooper)			Mr. Jerry Robbins		(TOTAL GROUP INVOLVEMENT DR. LINDSEY TODD)	Mr. Richard Pro
3B					Mr. R. Thompson Mr. G. Holland	Rev. Ezekiel Bell	Mr. Noble Hicks			
4 & 5					Mr. E. Kelly	Rev. Ezekiel Bell				
3 & 4					Mr. E. Kelly					

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY OF PLUS (+) AND NEGATIVE (-)
RESPONSES TO WORKSHOP BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroup	+	-	Net +	Net -
1A	29	23	6	
1B	28	22	6	
1C	11	22		11
2A	22	9	13	
2B	23	16	7	
2C	11	15		4
1 & 2A	20	13	7	
1 & 2B	11	24		13
1 & 2C	20	23		3
1 & 2D	27	17	10	
3A	26	15	11	
3B	8	11		3
3 & 4	25	19	6	
4A & B	21	23		2
Totals	282	252	66	36

Net Positive Responses for Total Group 30